

REMARKS

The Office Action dated 10 February 2009 has been fully considered by Applicant.

Enclosed is a Request for Continued Examination and a Petition For Three-Month Extension of Time and a check in payment of the government fees.

Claims 1 and 16-19 have been currently amended to include the limitations of claims 9 and 10. Claims 4-7 and 12-15 have been previously presented. Claims 2-3, and 8- 11 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 4, 12, 13, 15 and 17-19 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Publication No. 006681395B1 to Nishi in view of United States Patent No. 6,167,564 to Fontana et al are traversed herein.

Independent claim 1 has been currently amended to include that the program guide data may be adapted for display on a plurality of different devices by providing appropriate portions of the content-related information to the corresponding EPGs according to associated schema defined by a reference information model.

This has the advantageous effect that not only is the content-related information combined from different sources into a common format, but portions of the information can be provided to different EPGs subject to the requirements and capabilities of the EPGs.

In contrast, the Nishi patent teaches that a broadcaster may provide a number of different templates for formatting EPG data. As such, all of the EPG data is provided to each device with an EPG, but as some portions of the data may not be recognized by some devices (typically the less complex ones), particularly as the data has been combined from multiple sources, this disadvantageously wastes bandwidth and may even corrupt an EPG if the information type is not recognized.

It is believed that Applicants' currently amended independent claim 1, along with dependent claims 4-7, 9-10, and 12-15, is not taught or suggested in cited references, either taken alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Clearly, currently amended claim 19 is not taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and therefore Applicants sincerely believe that independent claim 19 is patentable.

Claims 3 and 5 rejected under United States Patent No. 6,243,707 to Humpleman et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,167,564 to Fontana et al and United States Patent No. 6,505,348 to Knowles et al and further in view of United States Publication No. 2002/0073081A1 to Kido are traversed herein.

Claim 3 has been currently canceled and claim 5 depends upon currently amended independent claim 1 and it is believed to be patentable over the cited references for the reasons stated above.

Claims 5-7, 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,681,395 to Nishi et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,167,564 to Fontana et al and in further view of United States Patent No. 6,505,348 to Knowles et al. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 9 and 10 have been currently canceled. Claims 5-7 depend upon currently amended independent claim 1. Applicants believe the cited references do not teach or suggest Applicants' invention for the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,681,395 to Nishi et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,167,564 to Fontana et al and in further view of United States Patent No. 6,243,707 to Humpleman et al.

Claim 14 depends upon dependent claim 13 which depends upon currently amended independent claim 1. Applicants believe that claim 4 is not taught or suggested in the cited references for the same reasons as stated above. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Independent claim 16 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,681,395 to Nishi et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,167,564 to Fontana et al and in further view of United States Publication No. 2002/0073081A1 to Kido.

Independent claim 16 has been currently amended to include the step of generating a plurality of different schema, based at least in part on the associated portions of the reference information model and corresponding to different types of electronic program guide.

Applicants' method has the advantage that program guide data may be adapted for display on a plurality of different devices by providing appropriate portions of the content-related information to the corresponding electronic program guides according to associated schema defined by a reference information model.

Clearly this step is not taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Applicants are grateful for the thorough examination of the application by Examiner Ustaris and believe the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If any further issues remain, a telephone conference with the Examiner is requested. If any further fees or refunds are associated with this action, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-1500.

Respectfully Submitted

HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN

Dated: 10 August 2009

BY: 

Mark G. Kachigian, Reg. No. 32,840

228 West 17th Place

Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119

(918) 584-4187

Attorneys for Applicant